

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

---

EDDIE JAMES KING,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

DR. LAWSON, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
5:17-cv-00303-TES-CHW

---

ORDER DENYING KING'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER

---

Before the Court is King's Motion to Reconsider [Doc. 101]. King asks the Court to reconsider its Order [Doc. 99] denying King's request to appeal *in forma pauperis* [Doc. 96]. In support of his Motion to Reconsider, King contends that "counsel for the defendant withheld information from the court that could have been helpful to Plaintiff." [Doc. 101, ¶ 2]. The remainder of King's objections argue that defense counsel aided the Defendant in violating King's Eighth Amendment rights. [Id. at ¶¶ 3–5].

Plaintiff failed to cite to an intervening change in the law, new evidence, or a need to correct a clear error in law or manifest injustice. *Bryant v. Walker*, No. 5:10-CV-84, 2010 WL 2687590, at \*1 (M.D. Ga. July 1, 2010) (quoting *Wallace v. Ga. Dep't of Transp.*, No. 7:04-cv-78, 2006 WL 1582409, at \*2 (M.D. Ga. June 6, 2006)) (stating motions for reconsideration are appropriate only if plaintiff demonstrates that "(1) there has

been an intervening change in the law, (2) new evidence has been discovered that was not previously available to the parties at the time the original order was entered, or (3) reconsideration is necessary to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice”). “A motion for reconsideration cannot be used to relitigate old matters, raise argument or present evidence that could have been raised prior to the entry of judgment.” *Gilliam v. U.S. Dep’t of Veterans Affs.*, No. 19-12984, 2020 WL 4382935, at \*6 (11th Cir. July 31, 2020) (quoting *Richardson v. Johnson*, 598 F.3d 734, (11th Cir. 2010)). King’s reasons for asking this Court to reconsider its Order could have been raised prior to the entry of judgment and are merely attempts to relitigate old matters. *See id.*

Therefore, King failed to demonstrate that granting him a motion for reconsideration is appropriate. Accordingly, King’s Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 101] is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 24th day of September, 2020.

S/ Tilman E. Self, III  
**TILMAN E. SELF, III, JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**